DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 137 HE 015 549

TITLE Education: Texas' Resource for Tomorrow. Report of the Governor's Committee on Education beyond the High School.

INSTITUTION Texas Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Austin.

PUB DATE 31 Aug 64

NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Advisory Committees; Educational Facilities Planning; *Educational Finance; *Financial Policy; Governmental Structure; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Money Management; Needs Assessment; Private Colleges; Public Policy; State Aid; State Colleges; State Government; *State Legislation

IDENTIFIERS *Blue Ribbon Commissions; *Texas

ABSTRACT

Reponsibilities of the Governor's Committee on Education beyond the High School, which was created in 1963 by Governor John Connally of Texas, are outlined. In addition, the creation of a Joint Advisory Committee on Government Operations in 1975 by the 65th Texas Legislature and a Special Committee on Higher Education Financing in Texas by the 66th Legislature are addressed in separate publications. Responsibilities for the Governor's Committee on Education beyond the High School include study of: the needs in Texas for educational opportunities beyond the high school during 1963-1973; present and potential resources of existing institutions and systems; and needed facilities and programs. The Joint Advisory Committee on Government Operations, as discussed in an excerpt from "Joint Advisory Committee on Government Operations: Final Report to the Governor of Texas and Members of the Sixty-Fifth Texas Legislature," (January 1977), was created to promote the economical delivery of services provided by state government by means of a comprehensive review of governmental structure and administration. Attention is directed to the cost-effectiveness improvement efforts and the structure and operation of the committee, results of a review of higher education costs and operations, and financing college construction. Finally, the proposed creation of a Special Committee on Higher Education Financing in Texas is outlined in "Senate Concurrent Resolution, S.C.R. No. 101." This committee would pay special attention to issues of facility financing, the impact of declining enrollments, the future of formula financing, and the adequacy of financial administration. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222137

Education: Texas' Resource for Tomorrow

Report of the Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School August 31, 1964

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Texas - Governor's Committee on Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

ENABLING LEGISLATION

As priority action, Governor John Connally recommended in his opening address to the 58th Legislature on January 15, 1963, emergency legislation which would create a Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. House Bill No. 1, embodying the recommendations, was enacted promptly and almost unanimously by the Legislature and was signed into law by Governor Connally on April 9, 1963.

Section 3 of the Act outlined some of the highlights of the responsibilities of the Committee:

> The Committee shall study the present status of public and private education beyond the high school with a view towards recommending to the Governor and the Legislature essential steps for achieving a standard of excellence second to none in the nation, giving attention to any factors it considers pertinent but including the following:
>
> (1) Inquire into the needs in Texas for educational opportunities beyond the high school during the next decade.
>
> (2) Assay the present and potential resources of existing institutions and systems, both private and public, for providing education of requisite quality for meeting these needs.
>
> (3) Propose a comprehensive development of programs and facilities for education beyond the high school of adequate quality to enable Texas, with maximum economy of resources and with preservation of the autonomy and voluntary character of private institutions, to seize and capitalize upon the opportunities for progress in the next decade.
>
> The above enumeration does not restrict in any way the Committee's latitude in its study of education beyond the high school, or recommendations on topics relating thereto which it may see fit to make.
>
> The Committee shall make a report not later than August 31, 1964, to the Governor and to each member of the Legislature on the results of its study and its recommendations.

THE STUDY COMMITTEE

In May, 1963, Governor Connally appointed the following individuals to membership on the Committee: H. B. Zachry, Chairman, Morgan J. Davis, Vice-Chairman, George R. Brown, Martin Burns, Elmer Danner, Mrs. Ray Dudley, J. Harold Dunn, Jenkins Garrett, Reynaldo G. Garza, John Gray, H. H. Imray, Gifford K. Johnson, Dr. Ben W. Jones, J. Erik Jonsson, Dr. Albert B. Martin, Dr. Abner V. McCall, Dr. Vernon McDaniel, J. M. Odom, Sister Mary Vincent O'Donnell, Dr. Harry H. Ransom, General James Earl Rudder, Tom Sealy, Dr. Willis Tate, M. Harvey Weil, and Dr. D. M. Wiggins.

The Committee membership included junior and senior college presidents, university presidents and chancellors, and 19 individuals from various professions and industry. Every member of the Committee either was or had been associated with educational institutions beyond the high school in a position of responsibility either as president, instructor, member or chairman of a governing board, or was or had been involved in his community in furthering improvement of education.

GOVERNOR CONNALLY'S CHARGE

In his charge to the Committee at its first official meeting, on June 4, 1963, in Austin, Governor Connally spelled out the members' responsibility:

> "This is not to be a partisan Committee. All shades of political philosophy are represented on it. It is not to be a sectional Committee, even though you come from the various parts of Texas. This is not to be an institutional Committee, though you represent many colleges and universities in your background and training. And although you come from many different professions and economic interests,

HE 015 549

you are here only as individuals. You are not on the Committee to represent your political philosophy, your section, your college, your profession, your economic interest. You do not represent anyone but yourself and the people of Texas. You have been appointed to the Committee to bring all of your knowledge, your experience, your creativity and your vision to bear on the problem of education beyond the high school, and to help point the direction for this great State of Texas in its educational enterprise."

In his address, "The Challenges We Face in Higher Education: A Charge to the Committee on Education Beyond the High School," the Governor outlined the task and raised important questions to be considered by the group. Two significant dimensions of the undertaking were identified when he said:

"*First*, we have the problem of how to catch up with the nation educationally. We are actually in a depressed educational area if judgment by many different standards in higher education is used. We do not like to face this fact, but regional standards are not enough in our time and as we plan for the future. We have been too casual and have not given enough attention to the educational task and the investment we have made in this important human resource for our region. The *second* important dimension to the task for Texas is the development of the kind of educational system adequate to back up a potential for the economic, industrial, political, and cultural expansion necessary for this great Southwest area.

"The coming decade will bring problems of magnitude and complexity. Startling new and different forms of technology will become part of the fabric of our society; change will permeate every phase of our civilization. These changes will bring challenges. In light of such challenges it is imperative that we take a good hard look at our educational enterprise."

Following the Governor's address, Chairman H. E. Zachry called the Committee into an organizational session. Responsibilities for studying the educational needs of Texas were divided among seven subcommittees.

Dr. A. B. Martin, President of Amarillo College and a member of the Committee, assumed duties as Executive Director of the study on August 21, and served until November 1, when illness and responsibilities as President of Amarillo College compelled him to resign from the executive directorship.

On November 13, Dr. A. B. Templeton, on leave from the Superintendency of Schools and Presidency of Alvin Junior College, was named Executive Director. On January 15, Dr. June Hyer, on leave of absence from the University of Houston, was named Director of Research for the study.

From July 1, 1963, to February 1, 1964, the various subcommittees, with specialized assistance from widely-recognized consultants, explored the many aspects of education beyond the high school and drafted their preliminary reports.

From February 19 through April 8, the full Committee met regularly to consider the recommendations of the respective subcommittees. Following completion of this phase, the Committee charged the staff with responsibility for drafting a preliminary report reflecting the actions taken.

Two subsequent drafts were proposed by the staff with direction from a special subcommittee. These drafts were fully reviewed by the full Committee, which jointly prepared the final text.

After extended consideration and deliberation, the Committee approved and adopted the final report and authorized its official transmittal and release to the Governor, members of the Legislature, and the people of Texas on August 31, 1964.

JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

FINAL REPORT

to the

GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

and

MEMBERS OF THE SIXTY-FIFTH TEXAS LEGISLATURE

JANUARY 1977

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, both state and federal governments have been characterized by rapid growth. Texas is not an exception to this national trend. Today, government services are provided to the state's citizens by over 200 state agencies, approximately 100 of which were created during the last 15 years. For the 1976-77 biennium, these agencies were appropriated over $12 billion dollars.

Searching for a means of addressing this problem, the Sixty-fourth Legislature in 1975 enacted Senate Bill 319 creating the Joint Advisory Committee on Government Operations. As stated in its enabling legislation, the over-riding purpose of the committee was to "promote the economical delivery of services provided by state government by means of a comprehensive review of governmental structure and administration."

To understand the operation of the Joint Advisory Committee, it is first helpful to describe other cost-effectiveness improvement efforts influencing the development of Senate Bill 319. After this description, an explanation of the structure and operation of the committee is provided.

Governmental evaluation and reorganization studies are often responses to an immediate issue or problem, though occasionally broad-based studies, inspired by a general desire to improve the quality of governmental operations, will take place. The first wave of state reorganization and evaluation studies was stimulated by a federal commission on economy and efficiency appointed by President Taft in 1911.

The appointment of a commission on economy and efficiency in 1911 was the first modern federal reorganization effort. The most widely known efforts, however, were probably the two Hoover commissions, appointed in 1949 and 1953. The most important outcome of the first Hoover commission was the Reorganization Act of 1949, allowing the president to reorganize executive departments subject to a congressional veto. The second Hoover commission had the primary responsibility of finding ways to control the continued expansion of the federal government.

An Illinois study, undertaken in 1917, resulted in a major consolidation of state agencies, and began one of the first periods of significant interest in state government operations. After this study some nine states began major evaluations and reorganizations over the next ten years. The late 1940's and early 1950's constituted the next notable period of evaluation and reorganization studies, with over 30 states initiating some sort of study. The final surge of evaluation and reorganization activity took place from 1967 to 1973, with 28 states sponsoring studies during this time.

While state government evaluation and reorganization efforts have been cyclical and perhaps even sporadic when viewed over time, there has been a consistency in their basic conception of how public enterprise ought to function. This basic conception, or assumption, is that government ought to be economical, efficient, effective, responsible, and accountable. The studies have sought ways to reduce the cost of government (economy), improve the delivery of services and improve the management of delivery systems (efficiency), and increase the ability of the voters to call the government to task (responsibility and accountability).

Texas has not actively participated in the evaluation/reorganization movement in the past. There have been periodic calls for examination of the structure and operation of state government, but until this report, only one major, state-financed study had been undertaken.

In 1931, the Forty-second Legislature created a joint committee to study the operation of state government and to make recommendations for administrative consolidation. The committee employed Griffenhagen & Associates to survey the structure and administration of state government and published the 13-volume Griffenhagen Report in January 1933. Since then, a number of special studies have been made by various groups at the Legislature's request. These studies have resulted in a number of organizational and operational changes indicating that Texas government has not ignored the need to review the results of government operations.

In November of 1972, the Texas voters adopted a constitutional amendment which set in motion a thorough study and revision of the state's fundamental law, culminating in the constitutional convention. However, the same voters who approved the initiation of the constitutional revision process in 1972 rejected the results of the process at the polls in 1974. The interest sparked by the convention was widespread: the people of Texas were interested in governmental operation, and were concerned that it be economical, efficient, effective, responsible, and accountable. They did not feel that a major restructuring and reorganization was necessary to accomplish these ends, however. Thus, while the constitutional revision process did not result in a new constitution, it was one of the primary elements setting the stage for the work of the Joint Advisory Committee.

In 1973, Texas instituted a system of program budgeting and evaluation. This system requires that each state agency or institution identify programs through which its services are delivered. Furthermore, through this system, agencies must delineate: 1) the explicit need for government services associated with each program; 2) the objectives desired to be achieved by the services provided; and 3) a means of quantitatively measuring the cost-effective movement toward these objectives. Though this system of budgeting and evaluation is relatively new, it has already provided the basic information base for determining appropriate funding levels for, and actual performance of, the programs of state government.

The interest developed by the constitutional revision process in reviewing government operations and the development of basic techniques to provide information necessary for this purpose provided a natural setting for the creation of the Joint Advisory Committee on Government Operations. The duties of the Joint Advisory Committee under Senate Bill 319 are set out below.

Under the provisions of Senate Bill 319, Acts of the Sixty-fourth Legislature, 1975 [see Appendix], the Joint Advisory Committee on Government Operations was charged with the following responsibilities:

- Develop proposals to increase the effectiveness of delivery of services to the citizens of the state.
- Provide for the improvement of the structure and administration of state government to assure the delivery of governmental services at the lowest possible cost.
- Recommend policies and programs to minimize creation of new departments and agencies of state government and to control the growth of existing departments and agencies.
- Propose recommendations for the elimination of government programs and services that duplicate or exceed in cost those same services offered by private business.

The committee is composed of 18 members, consisting of the Lieutenant Governor, who serves as Chairman, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as Vice-Chairman, the Secretary of State, three Senators, three Representatives and nine citizen members appointed by the Governor.

The committee's government officials brought with them their experience in law-making and implementation of state policies and programs. The citizen members brought with them their experience in the private sector which seeks economy, efficiency, and productivity in its endeavors. Early in its deliberations, the committee decided that it would not choose as its major focus an overall reorganization plan for state government. The committee felt that major alterations would be warranted only where a positive result could be demonstrated and proceeded with a conviction that the structure of state government was basically sound but that there were opportunities to strengthen or alter existing elements. In this respect, the committee took an approach unique among most other government reorganization efforts.

The committee decided to review and evaluate five areas of government containing the bulk of state expenditures: Health and Welfare, Education, Natural Resources, Management Review and Policy Direction, and Administration and Fiscal Management. Subcommittees were established to cover the designated work areas and the agencies

of state government were assigned to the appropriate subject areas. Staff support and funding for the committee came from existing state agencies, particularly the Legislative Budget Board, Legislative Council, Governor's Budget and Planning Office, and The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The subcommittees set about their work by developing thorough background descriptive material and fiscal data regarding the programs of all agencies. Upon analyzing this data, the subcommittees selected issues related to: 1) particular programs; 2) areas involving allocation of state resources among agencies to achieve a common purpose; and 3) common determinants affecting policy implementation within all areas of the state's service delivery system. Each committee posed the following questions as it addressed each issue: 1) What is the need for this program or service? 2) Can the effectiveness or efficiency in the delivery of these services be improved? 3) Are there instances where similar services are being provided in more than one agency to respond to similar needs, problems, or target groups? 4) Can these services be provided at a lower cost without inhibiting their effectiveness? 5) Can this service or improved services be provided at less cost or more effectively through modification of the existing delivery system or within another organizational framework?

The subcommittees solicited additional data from agencies and private citizens through public hearings, questionnaires, and site visits. Every effort was made to coordinate the work of the committee with studies being pursued by Senate and House interim committees as well as studies that were underway within departments and agencies. This effort proved helpful concerning recommendations developed in the area of natural resources and education. In addition, such information was sought jointly thus eliminating potential conflicts in reports on similar subjects. After carefully considering the information and analysis in the investigated areas, the subcommittees selected recommended courses of action to resolve the problems identified. The efforts of the committee spanned a thirteen-month period and resulted in the 113 recommendations contained in this report.

A brief summary of major issues considered may be helpful in understanding the broad scope of the committee actions. One of these issues involved the development of an ongoing process through which the overall product of government efforts could be reviewed as a natural adjunct to their normal operations. Provision for this review recognizes that governmental reorganization is or should be a continuing process in the sense that there is no one neat chart that can be drawn to ensure effective governmental operation. It is a process which should be incorporated into the day-to-day business of state government at a level where real operating difficulties can be surfaced and debated resulting in concrete workable solutions. Resistance to this type of ongoing change is to be expected and for this reason the committee has incorporated the feature of automatic termination of selected agencies and advisory committees. If this concept proves workable, it can be

extended to additional agencies in the future. Increased coordination and cooperation between agencies is also stressed as an integral part of these recommendations.

The need for modification in present state employment practices was noted by the committee and addressed through a series of recommendations which provide for a means of controlling employment growth yet builds in some incentives for increased productivity within the current work force. In addition, methods are suggested which will provide for easier access into the state's work force and greater job security once employed.

In the area of health and welfare services the committee determined that a major reorganization of existing agencies was the only course of action that would eliminate overlapping responsibilities which dilute resources and ensure a simplification of process. Specifically these recommendations provide for a combination of existing state agencies providing services for the broad categories of adults and youth.

Natural resource management was a second area in which the committee has proposed a major realignment. The three major agencies dealing with water resources presented an organizational structure which enhanced the potential for duplication and prevented the consistent application of water management, development and control techniques. The suggested combination set forth in the report should provide a structure which will be responsive to changing conditions and will allow for a clearer deliniation of responsibilities.

Within the area of education the committee recognized the need to control and channel the growth of higher education. The present complex and convoluted system for financing facilities for higher education was examined and the resulting recommendations provide for balancing needs against resources. Management of all educational resources and evaluation of their product was also delt with in the recommendations.

The major elements of the recommendations summarized above reflect the fact that the committee has consistently chosen to recommend changes in process over changes in product. The text which follows sets out the specific recommendations of the committee for each of the major areas reviewed. Legislative changes recommended are set forth in a separate volume.

EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The committee's review of higher and secondary education focused on the general aspects of attempting to formulate recommendations that would protect the substantial gains made in these areas over the past decade while reducing the growth rate and expenditures for some aspects within these fields of governmental endeavor. It is hoped that the funding growth in the future will be applied to enhancing the quality of education in the state. The review of cultural resources dealt primarily with the operation of state supported museums and recommendations for this element of government operations are structured to provide coordinated management and funding.

In general, the review indicated that the areas referenced are providing good quality services. However, the direction for the future needs to be clearly delineated. Recommendations for each of the major areas are summarized below.

Higher Education Costs and Operations

Growth in Higher Education

Testimony and data submitted to the committee clearly indicated that growth in the costs of higher education is increasing at a pace which exceeds enrollment growth. Projected costs of higher education to 1980 range from a low of $1.4 billion to a high of $1.6 billion. The lower projection represents a 23 percent increase over fiscal 1977 appropriated amounts and the higher one represents a 44 percent increase over fiscal 1977 appropriated amounts. If costs of higher education are to be stabilized and quality protected and improved, then funding must be concentrated on existing institutions. Further expansion will dilute resources available to improve quality in higher education. This is not to say that funds appropriated to higher education should be decreased, but that different priorities need to be established. It was felt that by holding the current number of institutions constant, maintaining the original thrust behind recently created upper level institutions and providing adequate safeguards through funding mechanisms for these developing institutions that quality can be maintained while restraining the rate of increase for additional funds. Recommendations 1 through 4 address these problems by:

1. Providing for no expansion beyond the current number of institutions unless approved by the Coordinating Board;

2. Requiring that the upper level institutions not be expanded in scope and maintain their original design; and

3. Continuing current types of funding arrangements.

Financing College Construction

The committee has attempted to balance construction needs against resources available for this purpose. Many of these recommendations were discussed and debated during the recent constitutional revision effort and bear further consideration by the Legislature. Of primary concern to the committee was the fact that bonded indebtedness for facilities at public senior colleges has almost tripled during the past ten years. During this same period increased levels of general revenue funds have been appropriated to construct new buildings and to repair and rehabilitate existing buildings. Primary attention was given to an assessment of: 1) expenditures and bonded indebtedness for college facilities; 2) projected resources; 3) future building needs; and 4) appropriateness of existing funding methods for present and projected needs. Recommendations 5 through 9 address these areas by:

1. Providing a dedicated source of construction funds to all colleges and Texas State Technical Institute through expansion of the coverage of the Permanent University Fund and the Ad Valorem Tax Fund;

2. Requiring that this source of funding be used as the sole source for acquisition, construction or renovation;

3. Broadening the uses to which the proceeds from the Permanent University Fund and Ad Valorem Tax Fund may be applied;

4. Prohibiting the creation of state debt except in certain prescribed instances; and

5. Providing for review and evaluation of the need for construction projects based on consideration of cost factors when the project exceeds $500,000 in cost.

Enrolled

S.C.R. No. 101

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The higher education system of Texas is one of the most important services provided by state government to the citizens of Texas; and

WHEREAS, The cost of higher education has grown from $278 million in 1968 to $1.2 billion in 1979; and

WHEREAS, State funding supported 22 campuses in 1968 and has been increased to support 36 campuses, system administrations, medical schools, the coordinating board, and other higher educational units in 1979; and

WHEREAS, After more than two decades of major expansion in higher education enrollments, numerous institutions are now suffering declines in enrollments; and

WHEREAS, Despite these reductions, the need for adequate facilities continues to exist; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate of the State of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, That the 66th Legislature hereby create a Special Committee on Higher Education Financing in Texas; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the committee make a thorough and comprehensive study of the financing of the higher education system in Texas with particular emphasis on providing the highest quality of educational services in the most efficient manner possible; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the committee give particular emphasis to the issues of facility financing, the impact of declining enrollments, the future of formula financing, and the adequacy of financial

administration; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the committee be composed of 11 members: the Lieutenant Governor, who shall serve as chair of the committee; the Speaker of the House, who shall serve as vice-chair of the committee; three members appointed by the Governor; three members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor; and three members appointed by the Speaker of the House; the appointed members may be legislators, other public officials, or representatives of the general public; the committee shall be operational when appointment of members is completed and shall subsequently hold meetings and public hearings at the call of the chair; the committee shall establish rules of procedure and may appoint an advisory committee if considered necessary for the effective discharge of its duties; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the committee have the power to issue process to witnesses at any place in the State of Texas, to compel the attendance of such witnesses, and to compel the production of all books, records, documents, and instruments that the committee may require; if necessary to obtain compliance with subpoenas and other process, the committee shall have the power to issue writs of attachment; all process issued by the committee may be addressed to and served by any peace officer of the State of Texas or any of its political subdivisions; the chair shall issue in the name of the committee such subpoenas and other process as the committee may direct; in the event that the chair is absent, the vice-chair or any designee of the chair is authorized to issue subpoenas or any other process in the same manner as the chair; witnesses attending

proceedings of the committee under process shall be reimbursed for their actual expenses not to exceed $30 per day of attendance and for their mileage or other travel expenses. The testimony given at any hearing conducted pursuant to this resolution shall be reduced to writing and shall be given under oath subject to the penalties of perjury; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Legislative Budget Board, Texas Legislative Council, Senate, House of Representatives, and Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, be authorized to provide staff support to the committee upon the request of the chair; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the committee be authorized to request the assistance, where needed in the discharge of its duties, of state agencies, departments, and offices and that it be the duty of such departments, agencies, and offices to assist the committee when requested to do so; the committee shall have the power to inspect the records, documents, and files of every department, agency, and office of the state to the extent necessary to the discharge of its duties within the area of its jurisdiction; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That from the Contingent Expense Fund of the Senate and the Contingent Expense Fund of the House equally, the members of the committee be reimbursed for their actual expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and that other necessary expenses of operation be paid from the Contingent Expense Fund of the Senate and the Contingent Expense Fund of the House equally; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the total expenditure by the committee not be

in excess of the sums listed in the following schedule:

Postage	$ 5,000
Communications	$ 5,000
Travel	$25,000
Printing	$ 7,000
Supplies, materials, and other operational expenses	$12,000;

and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the committee make a preliminary report to the Governor and members of the Legislature no later than September 1, 1980; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the committee make a complete report, including findings and recommendations and drafts of any legislation deemed necessary, to the Governor and to members of the 67th Legislature when it convenes in January, 1981; five copies of the completed report shall be filed in the Legislative Reference Library; five copies shall be filed with the Texas Legislative Council; and two copies shall be filed with the Chief Clerk of the House and two copies with the Secretary of the Senate; following official distribution of the committee report, all remaining copies shall be deposited with the Legislative Reference Librarian.

President of the Senate

Speaker of the House

I hereby certify that S.C.R. No. 101 was adopted by the Senate on May 25, 1979.

Secretary of the Senate

I hereby certify that S.C.R. No. 101 was adopted by the House on May 28, 1979.

Chief Clerk of the House

Approved:

Date

Governor